

must assuredly fall away the sympathy and support of all good men.

In the history of labor we think it may be found recorded that it has not always been content to use this lever of Right, but has sometimes discarded it for that of *Might*, and we believe that is one reason why the progress of labor has been and is so slow. The world is on the whole governed by principles of justice and fair play and is quick to recognize any infraction of these principles and to punish the wrongdoer, either positively, by active aid to his opponent or negatively by the withdrawal of its sympathy from himself. Whenever the promoters of the cause of labor have incited their followers to the committal of wrongful acts they have lost the sympathy of the people and to that extent have retarded their cause. It has been so retarded many times, and will be until it has come to recognize freely and fully the immutable truth, that to be permanently successful its advances must be made along the straight line of Right and Justice.

We have said that men have a right to combine for protection—to unite themselves together for the purpose of selling their labor in the highest market, and for other purposes having for their object the advancement and prosperity of their order. But they have *not* the right to combine for the purpose of preventing other men from selling *their* labor at what they think it is worth. But herein lies the whole trouble. If men may only unite, in a strike, for instance, themselves and are not to interfere with other men who will be only too glad to take their vacant places at the anvil, the vice, the bench, of what use is the strike? How are they benefitted by organization? This, it would seem to us is a most powerful argument against striking at all if there is any other means of removing the trouble. For it must be conceded by every honest mind that to prevent a man by force from offering his services where they are required and where he wishes to give them is tyranny of the very worst description. Suppose I go to a grocer for a pound of tea and say to him—

“A pound of 75c. tea, please.”

“We are now selling 75c. tea for \$1.” You must buy at that price.”

“But I can get as good tea as I want, as good as yours, for 75 cents.”

“Don't make any difference you must have dollar tea, or none.”

“Then I shall go some place else.”

“Oh, no, you won't though, I shall place these men beside you to prevent your buying any tea but mine. You will not be allowed to enter any other store—so you may as well 'come down' with your dollar at once.”

We presume this would be sauce for the gander, would't it? How long would such a grocer be permitted to carry on this sort of thing? Not a day.

Now when a workingman says “I am going to have such a price for my labor; I am going to have such and such things done or I will quit work,” so far he is quite within his right. But when he says, “I am not only going to quit work, but I am going to make everybody else in the shop quit work until my demands are satisfied, and further, I am going to prevent, by force if necessary, any other man from coming in to do that work,” then he is wrong, absolutely, undeniably wrong, and no amount of reasoning can make him right. If he had no resource; if he were compelled to submit to the decree of a tyrant employer with no other alternative but to strike then we might deem him to some extent justified in using extreme means to obtain his right. But he is not. The law provides a means whereby the difficulties that will arise between employer and employed may be adjusted. Why not use these means? Surely there are men in both ranks, masters and workmen, to whom such differences might be submitted, with confidence, and through whose intervention they might be amicably arranged, with the assistance, if necessary, of a third and disinterested party. Pending their decision work might go on, the wheels of business kept in motion, and not clogged and impeded as they sometimes now are by the action of bodies of men who have made certain demands, and who determine to do no work, nor allow it to be done until these demands are satisfied.

We are far from saying that the men are always to blame. There are doubtless employers who are tyrannical and proud, having no interest in those who work for them save to extort their last drop of sweat for the money they earn. If it were an understood thing that their tyranny and pride must run the gauntlet of an impartial tribunal which should sift all complaints and demands through the sieve of justice and fair play between man and man, and that such examination could be made *at once*, and without inordinate expense, there seems to be no good reason why such a course